

PATENT

2611

Unknown

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Art Unit:

Examiner:

In re the Application of:

DAVID H. COOK et al.

Serial No. 10/047,511

Filed: October 19, 2001

For:

SYSTEM AND METHOD FOR SELECTIVE

INSERTION OF CONTENT INTO STREAMING MEDIA

Assistant Commissioner of Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

RECEIVED

SEP 2 4 2002

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

RECEIVED

AUG 2 6 2002

Technology Center 2600

RESPONSE TO DECISION DISMISSING PETITION

Sir:

Responsive to the Decision Dismissing Petition mailed August 6, 2002, copy attached, applicants submit herewith the postcard bearing the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office date stamp indicating that all pages of the specification and claims were included with the application as filed in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on October 19, 2001. The postcard attached to the Petition submitted by Applicants' previous counsel did not have the PTO date stamp.

Applicants respectfully request that the Petition filed May 15, 2002 be granted and that page 6 of the application be inserted into the application as filed and be used in processing and examination of the present application.

Serial No. 10/047,511

Art Unit: 2611

Attorney's Docket No. LET-101

Entry of this document into this application and prompt notification thereof is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to applicants' representative's Deposit Account No. 50-1390. A duplicate copy of this paper is attached for that purpose.

Respectfully submitted,

DAVID H. COOK et al.

By:

Michael A. Oblon Reg. No. 42,956

Shaw Pittman LLP 1650 Tysons Blvd. McLean, VA 22102

Tel: 703-770-7627

Date: August 21, 2002

Document #: 1200049 v.1



100 - 100 J	Method (Sticture 1958 + 1954 Serial/Reg./Patent No. 16 Cliccures Mail No. 16 Cent. of Mailing (Express Mail No. 16 Cent. of Mailing (Express Mail No. 16 Cent. of Mailing (Express Mail No. 16 Cent. of Mailing (Mark/Intent-To-Us	ttal Letter! Jesign/Continuation/CIP/FWC/Divisional/PCT Jesign/Continuation/CIP/FWC/Divisional/PCT Jesign/Continuation/CIP/FWC/Divisional/PCT pages of Specification pages of Abstract pages of Formal/Informal Drawings	Information Discler Form copie Preliminary Amer Response to Mis Certified Copy o	ntion Priority Int of Small Entity Status nt of Small Entity Status sue Fee: Form PTO 85C	Other: EULIA. Check for \$ Total Deposit Account charge for \$ CH WASH	CEIVED BY THE PTO ON TH	ECEIVED EP 2 4 2002 ICE OF PETITIONS CEIVED 2 6 2002 gy Center 2600
	2.		•			The state of the s	





COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE WASHINGTON, D.C.

Paper No. 4

MCDERMOTT, WILL & EMERY 2700 SAND HILL ROAD MENLO PARK CA 94025



COPY MAILED

AUG 0 6 2002

In re Application of

Cook et al.

Application No. 10/047,511

Filed: 19 October, 2001

Attorney Docket No. 62967-035

OFFICE OF PETITIONS RECEIVED

AUG 2 6 2002

DECISION DISMISSING Technology Center 2600

PETITION

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.53 filed on 15 May, 2002, requesting that the above-identified application be accorded a filing date of 19 October, 2001, with Page 6 of the RECEIVED specification as a part of the original disclosure.

The petition is dismissed.

On 19 October, 2001, the application was filed.

SEP 2 4 2002

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

On 15 March, 2002, the Office of Initial Patent Examination (OIPE) mailed a Notice to File Missing Parts of Nonprovisional Nonprovisional Application stating that the application had been accorded a filing date of 19 October, 2001, but that, inter alia, Page 6 of the specification (description and claims) appeared to have been omitted from the application.

In response, on 15 May, 2002, the present petition was filed. Petitioners argue that Page 6 was not missing on 19 October, 2001. Petitioners point to their postcard receipt as evidence that Page 6 of the specification was among the application papers filed on 19 October, 2001. Petitioners request that the application be accorded a filing date of 19 October, 2001, with Page 6 as a part of the original disclosure.

The argument and evidence supplied with the petition have been carefully considered, but are not persuasive. The USPTO has a well-established and well-publicized practice of providing a receipt for papers filed in the USPTO to any applicant desiring a receipt. The practice requires that any paper for which a receipt is desired be filed in the USPTO with a self-addressed postcard

identifying the paper. A postcard receipt which itemizes and properly identifies the papers which are being filed serves as prima facie evidence of receipt in the USPTO of all the items listed thereon on the date stamped thereon by the USPTO. See section 503, Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP 503). Unfortunately, petitioners' postcard receipt does not bear an Office-date stamp from the USPTO. As such, the postcard receipt does not serve as evidence that the items listed therein were received in the USPTO. If petitioners have a copy of the postcard receipt for this application with a USPTO "Office date" stamp, a copy of that postcard should be submitted with any renewed petition.

The petition is <u>dismissed</u>.

The copy of Page 6 of the specification supplied with the present petition will not be used for processing or examination, but will be retained in the application file. Petitioners may choose to file Page 6 as a preliminary amendment. If Page 6 is filed as a preliminary amendment will be reviewed for new matter.

The petition fee of \$130.00 will not be refunded since the present petition was not necessitated by Office error.

The application is being returned to Initial Patent Examination Division for further processing with a filing date of 15 March, 2002, using the application papers filed on that date.

Telephone inquiries concerning this matter may be directed to the undersigned at (703)308-6918.

Douglas I. Wood

Senior Petitions Attorney

Office of Petitions

Office of the Deputy Commissioner

for Patent Examination Policy